arXiv:1601.02416v1 [math.MG] 11 Jan 2016

EXTENSION COMPLEXITY AND REALIZATION SPACES OF HYPERSIMPLICES

FRANCESCO GRANDE, ARNAU PADROL, AND RAMAN SANYAL

ABSTRACT. The (n,k)-hypersimplex is the convex hull of all 0/1-vectors of length n with coordinate sum k. We explicitly determine the extension complexity of all hypersimplices as well as of certain classes of combinatorial hypersimplices. To that end, we investigate the projective realization spaces of hypersimplices and their (refined) rectangle covering numbers. Our proofs combine ideas from geometry and combinatorics and are partly computer assisted.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **The extension complexity of hypersimplices.** The **extension complexity** or **nonnegative rank** $\mathrm{rk}_+(P)$ of a convex polytope P is the minimal number of facets (i.e., describing linear inequalities) of an extension, a polytope $\widehat{P}$ that linearly projects onto P. The motivation for this definition comes from linear optimization: The computational complexity of the simplex algorithm is intimately tied to the number of linear inequalities and hence it can be opportune to optimize over $\widehat{P}$. As a complexity measure, the nonnegative rank is an object of active research in combinatorial optimization; see [KLTT15]. There are very few families of polytopes for which the exact nonnegative rank is known. Determining the nonnegative rank is non-trivial even for polygons [FRT12, PP15, Shi, Shi14]. For important classes of polytopes exponential lower bounds obtained in [FMP+15, Rot13, Rot14] are celebrated results. In the first part of the paper we explicitly determine the nonnegative rank of the family of hypersimplices. For $0 \le k \le n$, the **(n,k)-hypersimplex** is the convex polytope

$$\Delta_{n,k} \;=\; \mathrm{conv}\,\{x \in \{0,1\}^n : x_1 + \cdots + x_n = k\}\,. \tag{1}$$

Hypersimplices were first described (and named) in connection with moment polytopes of orbit closures in Grassmannians (see [GGMS87]) but, of course, they naturally occur in combinatorial optimization. Indeed, our motivation for studying the nonnegative rank of hypersimplices comes from matroid theory. For a matroid M on the ground set $[n] = \{1,\dots,n\}$ and bases $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$, the associated **matroid base polytope** is the polytope

$$P_M \;:=\; \mathrm{conv}\{\mathbf{1}_B : B \in \mathcal{B}\},$$

where $\mathbf{1}_B \in \{0,1\}^n$ is the characteristic vector of $B \subseteq [n]$. Hence, the (n,k)-hypersimplex is the matroid base polytope of the uniform matroid $U_{n,k}$. In [GS], the first and third author studied **2-level matroids**, which exhibit extremal behavior with respect to various geometric and algebraic measures of complexity. In particular, it is shown that M is 2-level if and only if P_M is **psd minimal**. The **psd rank** $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{psd}}(P)$ of a polytope P is the smallest size of a spectrahedron (an affine section of the positive definite cone) that projects onto P. In [GRT13] it is shown that $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{psd}}(P) \ge \dim P + 1$ and polytopes attaining this bound are called psd minimal. Our starting point was the natural question of whether the class of 2-level

Date: January 12, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 90C57, 52B12, 15A23.

Key words and phrases. hypersimplices, extension complexity, nonnegative rank, rectangle covering number, realization spaces.

F. Grande was supported by DFG within the research training group "Methods for Discrete Structures" (GRK1408). A. Padrol and R. Sanyal were supported by the DFG Collaborative Research Center SFB/TR 109 "Discretization in Geometry and Dynamics".

matroids also exhibits an extremal behavior with respect to the nonnegative rank. We recall from [GS, Theorem 1.2] the following synthetic description of 2-level matroids: A matroid M is 2-level if and only if it can be constructed from uniform matroids by taking direct sums or 2-sums. So, the right starting point are the hypersimplices. Note that $\Delta_{n,k}$ is affinely isomorphic to $\Delta_{n,n-k}$. The hypersimplices $\Delta_{n,0}$ are points and $\Delta_{n,1} = \Delta_{n-1}$ is the standard simplex of dimension $n-1$. Their nonnegative ranks are 1 and n, respectively. Our first result concerns the extension complexity of the *proper* hypersimplices, that is, hypersimplices $\Delta_{n,k}$ with $2 \leq k \leq n-2$.

Theorem 1. *The hypersimplex $\Delta_{4,2}$ has extension complexity 6, the hypersimplices $\Delta_{5,2} \cong \Delta_{5,3}$ have extension complexity 9. For any $n \geq 6$ and $2 \leq k \leq n-2$, we have $\mathrm{rk}_+(\Delta_{n,k}) = 2n$.*

It is straightforward to check that

$$\Delta_{n,k} \;=\; [0,1]^n \cap \{x : x_1 + \cdots + x_n = k\} \tag{2}$$

and that for $1 < k < n-1$, all $2n$ inequalities of the n-cube are necessary. The nonnegative rank of a polytope is trivially upper bounded by the minimum of the number of vertices and the number of facets. We call a polytope P **extension maximal** if it attains this upper bound. The $(4,2)$-hypersimplex has 6 vertices and 8 facets and therefore has extension complexity ≤ 6. As $\Delta_{4,2}$ is combinatorially isomorphic to an octahedron, Corollary 11 implies that the extension complexity is indeed 6. Theorem 1 states that all proper hypersimplices with $n \geq 6$ are extension maximal.

To extend our results to 2-level matroids, it would be necessary to understand the effect of taking direct and 2-sums on the nonnegative rank. The direct sum of matroids translates into the Cartesian product of matroid polytopes. Two out of three authors of this paper conjecture the following (see also Corollary 10).

Conjecture 1. *The nonnegative rank is additive with respect to Cartesian products, that is,*

$$\mathrm{rk}_+(P_1 \times P_2) \;=\; \mathrm{rk}_+(P_1) + \mathrm{rk}_+(P_2),$$

for polytopes P_1 and P_2.

By taking products of extensions it trivially follows that the nonnegative rank is subadditive with respect to Cartesian products. As for the 2-sum $M_1 \oplus_2 M_2$ of two matroids M_1 and M_2, it follows from [GS, Lemma 3.4] that $P_{M_1 \oplus_2 M_2}$ is a codimension-1 section of $P_{M_1} \times P_{M_2}$ and the extension complexity is therefore dominated by that of the direct sum. Combined with Theorem 1 and [GS, Theorem 1.2] we obtain the following simple estimate.

Corollary 2. *If M is a 2-level matroid on n elements, then $\mathrm{rk}(P_M) \leq 2n$.*

1.2. **Combinatorial hypersimplices and realization spaces.** The extension complexity is not an invariant of the combinatorial type. That is, two combinatorially isomorphic polytopes do not necessarily have the same extension complexity. For example, the extension complexity of a hexagon is either 5 or 6 depending on the incidences of the facet-defining lines [PP15, Prop. 4]. On the other hand, the extension complexity of any polytope combinatorially isomorphic to the n-dimensional cube is always $2n$; cf. Corollary 11. The proximity to cubes and Theorem 1 prompt the natural question for **combinatorial** (n,k)-hypersimplices.

Question 1. *Is $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) = 2n$ for any combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex P with $n \geq 6$ and $2 \leq k \leq n-2$?*

For $n = 6$ and $k \in \{2,3\}$ this is true due to Proposition 15 but we suspect that the answer is no for some $n > 6$ and $k = 2, n-2$. The rectangle covering number $\mathrm{rc}(P)$ of a polytope P is a combinatorial invariant that gives a lower bound on $\mathrm{rk}_+(P)$; see Section 3. While the rectangle covering number of the *small* hypersimplices $\Delta_{6,2}$ and $\Delta_{6,3}$ is key to our proof of Theorem 1, it is not strong enough to resolve Question 1.

Theorem 3. *For any $2 \leq k \leq n$, we have $n \leq \mathrm{rc}(\Delta_{n,k}) \leq n + 2^k k! \lceil \log(n) \rceil^k$.*

The **projective realization space** $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$ of combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplices parametrizes the polytopes combinatorially isomorphic to $\Delta_{n,k}$ up to projective transformation. The extension complexity is invariant under (admissible) projective transformations and hence rk_+ is well-defined on $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$. (Projective) Realization spaces are notoriously (and even universally) complicated objects [Mnë88, RG96]. We show that $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$ is related to the algebraic variety of n-by-n matrices with vanishing principal k-minors that was studied by Wheeler [Whe], and for $k = 2$ we completely determine the realization space.

Theorem 4. *For $n \geq 4$, $\mathcal{R}_{n,2}$ is homeomorphic to the interior of a $\binom{n-1}{2}$-dimensional cube. In particular, $\mathcal{R}_{n,2}$ is an open ball and hence contractible.*

In contrast, our findings suggest that the realization spaces $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$ with $2 < k < n-2$ are more involved. In particular, we can currently not exclude that $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$ is disconnected and has components of different dimensions.

The locus $E_{n,k} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{n,k}$ of extension maximal (n,k)-hypersimplices is open and Theorem 1 implies that $E_{n,k}$ is non-empty for $n \geq 6$ and $2 \leq k \leq n-2$. For $k = 2$, we can say considerably more.

Corollary 5. *For $n \geq 5$, the combinatorial $(n,2)$-hypersimplices with extension complexity $2n$ are dense in $\mathcal{R}_{n,2}$.*

This follows from results on FG-generic hypersimplices, which are characterized by the non-vanishing of a determinantal condition on $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$. We show that all FG-generic hypersimplices are extension maximal (Theorem 16). The corollary then follows for $n \geq 6$ from the fact that FG-generic realizations of the $(n,2)$-hypersimplices are dense. The result also underlines that the standard realization $\Delta_{5,2}$ of the $(5,2)$-hypersimplex $\Delta_{5,2}$ is exceptional, since it has smaller extension complexity that a generic instance. In Section 5.1, we use a variation of the *refined* rectangle covering numbers of [OVW] to prove Corollary 5 for $(n,k) = (5,2)$.

Unfortunately, FG-genericity is not a property met by all hypersimplices, which is confirmed by the existence of a non-FG-generic realization of $\Delta_{6,2}$; see Proposition 21. On the other hand, we show that hypersimplices with $n \geq 6$ and $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \leq k \leq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ are FG-generic, which ensues the following.

Corollary 6. *If P is a combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex with $n \geq 6$ and $2 \leq k \leq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$, then*

$$\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \;\geq\; \begin{cases} n + 2k + 1 & \text{if } k < \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor, \\ 2n & \text{if } k \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor. \end{cases}$$

We do not know of any realization of a (n,k)-hypersimplex with $n \geq 6$ of extension complexity less than $2n$, but we do not dare to conjecture that every combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex with $n \geq 6$ and $2 \leq k \leq n$ is extension maximal. Our results on FG-generic hypersimplices, on the other hand, strongly suggest that Corollary 5 extends to all the cases.

Conjecture 2. *For $n \geq 5$ and $2 \leq k \leq n-2$, the combinatorial hypersimplices of nonnegative rank $2n$ form a dense open subset of $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$.*

1.3. **Structure of the paper.** Theorem 1 is proved in Sections 2 and 3. In Section 2 we investigate the discrete geometry of extensions and we set up an induction that deals with the *large* hypersimplices $\Delta_{n,k}$ with $n > 6$. In particular, we devise general tools for upper bounding the extension complexity. For the *small* hypersimplices $\Delta_{6,2}$ and $\Delta_{6,3}$, we make use of rectangle covering numbers in Section 3. We show that most of the geometric tools of Section 2 have combinatorial counterparts for rectangle covering numbers. Section 4 is devoted to the study of combinatorial hypersimplices and the associated realization spaces. In Section 5 we focus on the combinatorial $(n,2)$-hypersimplices.

2. The geometry of extensions and large hypersimplices

In this section we develop some useful tools pertaining to the geometry of extensions. These will be used to give an inductive argument for the *large* hypersimplices $\Delta_{n,k}$ with $n > 6$ and $1 < k < n-1$. The *small* hypersimplices are treated in the next section.

For a polytope P, we write $v(P)$ for the number of vertices of P and $f(P)$ for the number of facets. Moreover, $\widehat{P}$ will typically denote an extension of P and the linear projection that takes $\widehat{P}$ to P is π. We start with the simple observation that the nonnegative rank is strictly monotone with respect to taking faces.

Lemma 7. *Let P be a polytope and $F \subset P$ a facet. Then*

$$\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \;\geq\; \mathrm{rk}_+(F) + 1.$$

Proof. Let $\widehat{P}$ be a minimal extension of P. The preimage $\widehat{F} = \pi^{-1}(F) \cap \widehat{P}$ is an extension of F. Every facet of $\widehat{F}$ is the intersection of a facet of $\widehat{P}$ with $\widehat{F}$. Moreover, since $\widehat{F}$ is a proper face of $\widehat{P}$, there are at least $c \geq 1$ facets of $\widehat{P}$ that contain $\widehat{F}$ and hence do not contribute facets to $\widehat{F}$. It follows that

$$\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \;=\; f(\widehat{P}) \;\geq\; f(\widehat{F}) + c \;\geq\; \mathrm{rk}_+(F) + 1,$$

which proves the claim. □

By induction, this extends to lower dimensional faces.

Corollary 8. *Let P be a polytope and $F \subset P$ a face. Then*

$$\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \;\geq\; \mathrm{rk}_+(F) + \dim(P) - \dim(F).$$

We can strengthen this observation if we take into consideration more than one facet.

Lemma 9. *Let P be a polytope and let F_1 and F_2 be two disjoint facets of P. Then*

$$\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \;\geq\; \min\{\mathrm{rk}_+(F_1), \mathrm{rk}_+(F_2)\} + 2.$$

Proof. If $\mathrm{rk}_+(F_1) > \mathrm{rk}_+(F_2)$, the claim follows from Lemma 7. Hence, we can assume that $\mathrm{rk}_+(F_1) = \mathrm{rk}_+(F_2) = k$. Extending the argument of Lemma 7, let $\widehat{P}$ be a minimal extension of P and $\widehat{F}_i$ the preimage of F_i for $i = 1, 2$. Let c_i be the number of facets of $\widehat{P}$ containing $\widehat{F}_i$. Since $f(\widehat{P}) \geq k + c_i$, the relevant case is $c_1 = c_2 = 1$. Now, $\pi(\widehat{F}_1 \cap \widehat{F}_2) \subseteq F_1 \cap F_2 = \varnothing$ implies that $\widehat{F}_1$ and $\widehat{F}_2$ are disjoint facets of $\widehat{P}$. Hence, $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) = f(\widehat{P}) \;\geq\; k + 2$. □

We cannot replace min with max in Lemma 9: The convex hull of the 12 columns of the matrix

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & -2 & -2 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\
2 & 2 & -2 & -2 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\
\hline
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1
\end{array}\right)$$

gives rise to a 4-dimensional polytope Q combinatorially isomorphic to product of a triangle and a quadrilateral, and consequently has 7 facets. If we project onto the first three coordinates we obtain a 3-dimensional polytope P with two parallel facets, F_1 and F_2, that are an octagon and a square, with nonnegative ranks 6 and 4, respectively. Thus, $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \leq 7 < \max\{\mathrm{rk}_+(F_1), \mathrm{rk}_+(F_2)\} + 2 = 8$. Figure 1 gives an idea of the geometry underlying Q.

Combining Lemma 7 and Lemma 9 yields the following result pertaining to Conjecture 1.

Corollary 10. *Let P be a non-empty convex polytope and $k \geq 1$. Then*

$$\mathrm{rk}_+(P \times \Delta_k) \;=\; \mathrm{rk}_+(P) + k + 1.$$

FIGURE 1. The left figures gives a sketch (not a Schlegel diagram) of the geometric idea underlying the construction of Q. It is a union of three facets that yield the projection on the right. We highlighted the structure as a product of polygons, that makes it more visible how the two square faces of Q yield the octogonal face of P.

Proof. Let $\widehat{P}$ be a minimal extension of P with $\mathrm{rk}_+(P)$ facets. Since the number of facets of a product add up, $\widehat{P} \times \Delta_k$ is an extension of $P \times \Delta_k$ with $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) + k + 1$ facets. Thus, we need to show that $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) + k + 1$ is also a lower bound.

For $k = 1$, the polytope $P \times \Delta_1$ is a prism over P with two distinct facets isomorphic to P and the claim follows from Lemma 9. If $k > 1$, note that $P \times \Delta_{k-1}$ is a facet of $P \times \Delta_k$ and using Lemma 7 yields the claim by induction on k. □

Another byproduct is a simple proof that every combinatorial cube is extension maximal (see [FKPT13, Proposition 5.9]).

Corollary 11. *If P is combinatorially equivalent to the n-dimensional cube $C_n = [0,1]^n$, then* $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) = 2n$.

Proof. Since $f(P) = f(C_n) = 2n$, we only need to prove $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \geq 2n$. For $n = 1$, P is a 1-dimensional simplex for which the claim is true. For $n \geq 2$ observe that P has two disjoint facets F_1, F_2 that are combinatorially equivalent to $(n-1)$-cubes. By induction and Lemma 9 we compute $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \geq \mathrm{rk}_+(C_{n-1}) + 2 = 2n$. □

With these tools, we are ready to prove Theorem 1 for the cases with $n > 6$. The case $n = 6$ and $1 < k < n-1$ will be treated in Proposition 15 in the next section. A key property, inherited from cubes, that allows for an inductive treatment of hypersimplices is that for $1 < k < n-1$, the presentation (2) purports that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i &:= \Delta_{n,k} \cap \{x_i = 0\} \cong \Delta_{n-1,k}, \text{ and} \\ G_i &:= \Delta_{n,k} \cap \{x_i = 1\} \cong \Delta_{n-1,k-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

are disjoint facets for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. We call these the ***F*-facets** and ***G*-facets**, respectively.

Proposition 12. *Assume that* $\mathrm{rk}_+(\Delta_{6,2}) = \mathrm{rk}_+(\Delta_{6,3}) = 12$. *Then* $\mathrm{rk}_+(\Delta_{n,k}) = 2n$ *for all* $n > 6$ *and* $1 < k < n-1$.

Proof. Let $n \geq 7$. For $2 < k < n-2$, the pairs of disjoint facets (3) allow us to use Lemma 9 together with induction on n and k to establish the result. Hence, the relevant cases are $n \geq 7$ and $k = 2$ (which is equivalent to $k = n-2$).

For $k = 2$, let

$$\widehat{P} = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \ell_i(y) \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, M\}$$

be an extension of $\Delta_{n,k}$ with $M = \mathrm{rk}_+(\Delta_{n,k})$ and let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ the linear projection that takes $\widehat{P}$ to $\Delta_{n,k}$. If for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, the preimage $\widehat{F}_i = \pi^{-1}(F_i) \cap \widehat{P}$ is not a facet then $f(\widehat{P}) \geq \mathrm{rk}_+(F_i) + 2 = 2n$ by induction and we are done. So, we have to assume that $\widehat{F}_i = \{y \in \widehat{P} : \ell_i(y) = 0\}$ is a facet of $\widehat{P}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

It is sufficient to show that the polyhedron $\widehat{Q} := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \ell_i(y) \geq 0 \text{ for } i = n+1, \dots, M\}$ is bounded and hence has $f(\widehat{Q}) \geq m+1 \geq n$ facets. Since $f(\widehat{P}) = n + f(\widehat{Q})$ this implies the result.

The key observation is that the polyhedron $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ bounded by the hyperplanes defining the facets G_i of $\Delta_{n,k}$ is a simplex of dimension $n-1$. We claim that $\pi(\widehat{Q}) \subseteq Q$. Indeed, if $G_i^\perp$ is the hyperplane supporting G_i, then $\pi^{-1}(G_i^\perp)$ supports a face of $\widehat{Q}$ that contains $\widehat{G}_i := \pi^{-1}(G_i) \cap \widehat{P}$. Otherwise, $\widehat{G}_i \subseteq \widehat{F}_j$ for some $j = 1, \dots, n$ and this would imply $G_i \subseteq F_j$. This, however, cannot happen as $G_i = \pi(\widehat{G}_i)$ is a facet of $\Delta_{n,k}$. Therefore, the lineality space of $\widehat{Q}$ is contained in the kernel of π. However, the affine hull $\operatorname{aff}(\widehat{F}_i)$ is parallel to $\ker \pi$ and thus $\widehat{Q}$ is bounded since we assumed that $\widehat{P}$ is bounded. □

3. Rectangle covering numbers and small hypersimplices

In this section we treat the small hypersimplices $4 \leq n \leq 6$ and $1 < k < n-1$. We will do this by way of rectangle covering numbers. The rectangle covering number, introduced in [FKPT13], is a very elegant, combinatorial approach to lower bounds on the nonnegative rank of a polytope. For a polytope

$$P \;=\; \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \ell_1(x) \geq 0, \dots, \ell_M(x) \geq 0\} \;=\; \operatorname{conv}(v_1, \dots, v_N),$$

the **slack matrix** is the nonnegative matrix $S_P \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}_{\geq 0}$ with $(S_P)_{ij} = \ell_i(v_j)$. A **rectangle** of S_P is an index set $R = I \times J$ with $I \subseteq [M]$, $J \subseteq [N]$ such that $(S_P)_{ij} > 0$ for all $(i,j) \in R$. The **rectangle covering number** $\operatorname{rc}(S_P)$ is the smallest number of rectangles $R_1, \dots, R_s$ such that $(S_P)_{ij} > 0$ if and only if $(i,j) \in \bigcup_t R_t$. As explained in [FKPT13, Section 2.4]

$$\operatorname{rc}(S_P) \;\leq\; \operatorname{rk}_+(P).$$

There are strong ties between the geometry of extensions and rectangle covering numbers. In particular our geometric tools from Section 2 have independent counterparts for rectangle covering numbers. Note that although the results are structurally similar they do not imply each other and even the proofs are distinct.

Lemma 13. *Let P be a polytope and $F \subset P$ a facet. Then*

$$\operatorname{rc}(S_P) \;\geq\; \operatorname{rc}(S_F) + 1.$$

Moreover, if there is a facet $G \subset P$ disjoint from F, then

$$\operatorname{rc}(S_P) \;\geq\; \min\{\operatorname{rc}(S_F), \operatorname{rc}(S_G)\} + 2.$$

Proof. In the first case, part of the slack matrix of S_P is of the form

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} 0 \cdots 0 & a \\ \hline S_F & \begin{array}{c} * \\ \vdots \\ * \end{array} \end{array}\right],$$

and since F is a facet, $a > 0$. There are at least $\operatorname{rc}(S_F)$ rectangles necessary to cover S_F. None of these rectangles can cover a as this is obstructed by the zero row above S_F.

For the second case, we may assume that $r = \operatorname{rc}(S_F) = \operatorname{rc}(S_G)$. Similarly, we can assume that parts of S_P look like

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc|c} 0 \cdots 0 & a_1 \cdots a_l & \\ b_1 \cdots b_k & 0 \cdots 0 & \\ \hline & \begin{array}{ccc} * & \cdots & * \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ * & \cdots & * \end{array} & \\ S_F & & \\ \hline \begin{array}{ccc} * & \cdots & * \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ * & \cdots & * \end{array} & & S_G \end{array}\right]$$

with $a_1, \dots, a_l, b_1, \dots, b_k > 0$. There are r rectangles necessary to cover S_F. None of these rectangles can cover the first row. If the first row is covered with ≥ 2 rectangles, we are done. If, however, a single rectangle covers the first row, then it cannot cover any row of S_G. Indeed, every row of S_G corresponds to a facet of G and contains at least one vertex of G. Hence, every row of S_G has one zero entry. Since also S_G needs at least r rectangles to be covered, by the same token we obtain that the second row must be covered by a unique rectangle which does not extend to S_F or S_G. Consequently, at least $r+2$ rectangles are necessary. □

The example from Section 2 shows that similar to Lemma 9, we cannot replace min with max. It can be checked that the rectangle covering number of an octagon is 6.

As direct consequence we obtain a lower bound on rectangle covering numbers.

Corollary 14. *Let P be a d-polytope, then* $\operatorname{rc}(S_P) \geq d+1$.

It was amply demonstrated in [KW15, FMP+15] that the rectangle covering number is a very powerful tool. We use it to compute the nonnegative rank of small hypersimplices. For a given polytope P with slack matrix $S = S_P$ the decision problem of whether there is a rectangle covering with r rectangles can be phrased as a satisfiability problem: For every rectangle R_l and every (i,j) with $S_{ij} > 0$ we designate a Boolean variable X^l_{ij}. If X^l_{ij} is true, this signifies that $(i,j) \in R_l$. Every (i,j) has to occur in at least one rectangle. Moreover, for (i,j) and (i',j') if $S_{ij} \cdot S_{i'j'} > 0$ and $S_{ij'} \cdot S_{i'j} = 0$, then (i,j) and (i',j') cannot be in the same rectangle. The validity of the resulting Boolean formula can then be verified using a SAT solver. For the hypersimplices $\Delta_{n,k}$ with $1 < k < n-1$, the sizes of the slack matrix is $2n \times \binom{n}{k}$. For $n \leq 6$ these sizes are manageable and the satisfiability problem outlined above can be decided by a computer. For example, for $(n,k) = (6,3)$ this yields 1320 Boolean variables and 55566 clauses in a conjunctive normal form presentation. The attached `python` script produces a SAT instance for all (n,k,r) and we used `lingeling` [BHJ14] for the verification. This gives a computer-aided proof for the small cases which also completes our proof for Theorem 1.

Proposition 15. *For $n \leq 6$, $\operatorname{rc}(\Delta_{n,k}) = \operatorname{rk}_+(\Delta_{n,k})$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. In particular,* $\operatorname{rk}_+(\Delta_{4,2}) = 6$, $\operatorname{rk}_+(\Delta_{5,2}) = \operatorname{rk}_+(\Delta_{5,3}) = 9$, *and* $\operatorname{rk}_+(\Delta_{6,2}) = \operatorname{rk}_+(\Delta_{6,3}) = 12$.

Proof. The hypersimplex $\Delta_{4,2}$ is a 3-dimensional polytope with 6 vertices and, more precisely, affinely isomorphic to the octahedron. Since the nonnegative rank is invariant under taking polars, Corollary 11 asserts that the nonnegative rank is indeed 6. The polytope $\Delta_{5,2}$ is a 4-dimensional polytope with 10 vertices and facets. Its nonnegative rank is 9. It was computed in [OVW, Table 3] under the ID 6014. Alternatively it can be computed with the `python` script in the appendix. Using, for example, `polymake` [GJ00], removing two non-adjacent vertices of $\Delta_{5,2}$ yields a 4-dimensional polytope Q with 8 vertices and 7 facets. Taking a 2-fold pyramid over Q gives an extension of $\Delta_{5,2}$ with 9 facets. Finally, $\Delta_{6,2}$ and $\Delta_{6,3}$ are 5-polytopes with 12 facets and the SAT approach using the attached *python* script yields the matching lower bound on the rectangle covering number. □

The hypersimplex $\Delta_{5,2}$ is special. We will examine it more closely in Section 5.1 and we will, in particular, show that up to a set of measure zero all realizations have the expected nonnegative rank 10.

It is tempting to think that Proposition 12 might hold on the level of rectangle covering numbers. Indeed, such a result would imply that all *combinatorial* hypersimplices are extension maximal. As can be checked with the `python` script in the appendix, Proposition 15 extends at least to $n = 8$. In fact, the results above imply that $\operatorname{rc}(\Delta_{n,k}) = 2n$ when $\max\{2, n-6\} \leq k \leq \min\{n-2, 6\}$. However, the following theorem shows just how deceiving the situation is in small dimensions. Although the estimate in the proof is quite crude and could easily be improved, it is sufficient to show the existence of pairs (n,k) for which $\operatorname{rc}(\Delta_{n,k}) < 2n$; for example, $\operatorname{rc}(\Delta_{1000,2}) < 2000$. In Example 2, we argue that the proof of Theorem 3 already shows that $\operatorname{rc}(\Delta_{64,2}) \leq 116$, which is currently the smallest non-trivial

hypersimplex (with $n \geq 6$) for which we know that the rectangle covering number is smaller than $2n$. The mechanics of the proof are illustrated in Example 1.

Theorem 3. The rectangle covering number of the (n,k)-hypersimplex satisfies

$$n \;\leq\; \mathrm{rc}(\Delta_{n,k}) \;\leq\; n + 2^k k! \lceil \log(n) \rceil^k.$$

Proof. The lower bound follows from Corollary 14. For the upper bound, we may assume that $k \leq \frac{n}{2}$ (the range were the bound is not trivial is much smaller) and consider the matrix $\mathcal{G}(n,k)$ whose columns are the $0/1$ vectors with k zeros. This is the half of the slack matrix of $\Delta_{n,k}$ that arises from the G_i facets (when $2 \leq k \leq n-2$). We prove that $\mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(n,k)) \leq 2^k k! \lceil \log(n) \rceil^k$. Since this covering can be extended to a covering of the slack matrix of $\Delta_{n,k}$ by adding an extra rectangle for each of the remaining n rows, this implies our claim.

The proof uses a double induction, on k and n, and is obvious when $k = 0$ or $n = k$. Assume that n is a power of 2. Then we can reorder the columns of $\mathcal{G}(n,k)$ so that it is divided into $k+1$ vertical blocks according to the number of zeros lying in the $\frac{n}{2}$ first coordinates. These are blocks of the form:

$$B_i \;:=\; \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{1}_{1\times\binom{n/2}{k-i}} \otimes \mathcal{G}(n/2, i) \\ \hline \mathcal{G}(n/2, k-i) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{1\times\binom{n/2}{i}} \end{array}\right],$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{a\times b}$ represents the $a \times b$ matrix of ones, and $\otimes$ is the Kronecker product of matrices.

By induction, if $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, we can cover B_i with $2^i i! \log^i(n/2) + 2^{k-i}(k-i)! \log^{k-i}(n/2)$ rectangles. Indeed, we can cover separately the upper and lower parts of B_i, which up to repeated columns are copies of $\mathcal{G}(n/2, i)$ and $\mathcal{G}(n/2, k-i)$, respectively.

It remains to cover the blocks corresponding to $i = 0$ and $i = k$. This is a submatrix that looks like:

$$B_{0k} \;:=\; \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{1}_{n/2\times\binom{n/2}{k}} & \mathcal{G}(n/2, k) \\ \hline \mathcal{G}(n/2, k) & \mathbb{1}_{n/2\times\binom{n/2}{k}} \end{array}\right].$$

It can be covered with $2 + \mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(n/2,k)) \leq 2 + 2^k k! \log^k(n/2)$ rectangles. If $R = I \times J$ is a rectangle of $\mathcal{G}(n/2,k)$, then $(I \cup I + n/2) \times (J \cup J + \binom{n/2}{k})$ is a rectangle of B_{0k}. Hence, any covering of $\mathcal{G}(n/2,k)$ induces a collection of rectangles in B_{0k} that cover the two copies of $\mathcal{G}(n/2,k)$ simultaneously. This might leave some entries uncovered, but only in the upper-left and lower-right blocks of ones, which can be covered with two extra rectangles.

Actually, these two extra rectangles are not necessary for covering $\mathcal{G}(n,k)$ if $k > 1$, since these gaps can be also covered by extending rectangles from the remaining B_i's. We omit them to make the computations simpler (the analysis for $k = 1$ to get $\mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(n,1)) \leq 2\log(n)$ is analogous).

Therefore, combining all the covering from the distinct blocks (without these two extra blocks that are replaced by extensions from the intermediate blocks), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(n,k)) \;&\leq\; 2^k k! \log^k(n/2) + 2\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} 2^i i! \log^i(n/2) \\ &\leq\; 2^k k! (\log(n)-1)^k + 2(k-2)2^{k-1}(k-1)!(\log(n)-1)^{k-1} \\ &\leq\; 2^k k! \log^{k-1}(n)(\log(n)-1) + 2^k k! \log^{k-1}(n) \\ &=\; 2^k k! \log^k(n). \end{aligned}$$

□

Example 1. We illustrate the ideas underlying the proof of Theorem 3 on the hypersimplex $\Delta_{8,2}$. The "lower part" of its slack matrix (corresponding to the G facets) is the following matrix $\mathcal{G}(8,2)$, which we subdivide according to the number of 0's in the first 4 lines:

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccccc|cccccccccccccccc|cccccc}
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&0&1&0&0\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&0&1&0&1&0\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&0&1&1&0&0&1\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&0&0&1&1&1\\
\hline
1&1&0&1&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
1&0&1&0&1&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
0&1&1&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
0&0&0&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1
\end{array}\right]$$

B_0 B_1 B_2

To illustrate the inductive steps, we just take the standard rectangle coverings for $\mathcal{G}(4,2)$ and $\mathcal{G}(4,1)$ given by the rows (instead of that constructed recursively, because the pictures would be less clear). That is,

$$\mathcal{G}(4,2)=\begin{bmatrix}1&1&0&1&0&0\\1&0&1&0&1&0\\0&1&1&0&0&1\\0&0&0&1&1&1\end{bmatrix}\quad\text{and}\quad\mathcal{G}(4,1)=\begin{bmatrix}1&1&1&0\\1&1&0&1\\1&0&1&1\\0&1&1&1\end{bmatrix}.$$

Up to some holes in the upper-left and lower-right corners, we can extend the covering of $\mathcal{G}(4,2)$ to the union of the blocks B_0 and B_2.

$$B_{02}=\left[\begin{array}{cccccc|cccccc}
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&0&0\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&0&1&0\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&0&0&1\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&1&1&1\\
\hline
1&1&0&1&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
1&0&1&0&1&0&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
0&1&1&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1
\end{array}\right],$$

We can also extend horizontally two independent copies of the covering $\mathcal{G}(4,1)$ to the upper and lower parts of B_1

$$B_1=\left[\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0\\
1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1\\
1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1\\
0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1\\
\hline
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1\\
1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1
\end{array}\right].$$

We can combine now these two coverings, extending the rectangles of B_1 to the sides to finish covering the corners, to get a covering of $\mathcal{G}(8,2)$:

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccccc|cccccccccccccccc|cccccc}
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&0&1&0&0\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&0&1&0&1&0\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&0&1&1&0&0&1\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&0&0&0&1&1&1\\
\hline
1&1&0&1&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
1&0&1&0&1&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
0&1&1&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\
0&0&0&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1
\end{array}\right].$$

In this case, this technique gives a covering of $\mathcal{G}(8,2)$ with 12 rectangles, which can be extended to the whole slack matrix by adding 8 extra rectangles for the remaining rows. For $\Delta_{8,2}$, this is of course less efficient than taking the covering induced by the rows, which is of size 16. For larger values of n, however, our technique produces a covering of size much smaller than $2n$.

Example 2. The same proof shows that $\mathrm{rc}(\Delta_{64,2}) = 116$ because $\mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(64,2)) \leq 64$. Indeed, our proof shows that $\mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(64,2)) \leq 2 \cdot \mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(32,1)) + \mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(32,2))$. Using our recursive method, we see that $\mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(32,1)) \leq 10$ (see Figure 2). We get $\mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(64,2)) \leq 52$ from $\mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(32,2)) \leq 32$.



FIGURE 2. Visual proof that $\mathrm{rc}(\mathcal{G}(32,1)) \leq 10$.

4. Combinatorial hypersimplices and realization spaces

Typically, the extension complexity is not an invariant of the combinatorial isomorphism class of a polytope (see, for example, the situation with hexagons [PP15]). However, Corollary 11 states that every combinatorial cube, independent of its realization, has the same extension complexity. The proximity to cubes and the results in Sections 2 and 3 raised the hope that this extends to all hypersimplices. A **combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex** is any polytope whose face lattice is isomorphic to that of $\Delta_{n,k}$. One approach would have been through rectangle covering numbers but Theorem 3 refutes this approach in the strongest possible sense.

We extend the notions of F- and G-facets from (3) to combinatorial hypersimplices. The crucial property that we used in the proof of Proposition 12 was that in the standard realization of $\Delta_{n,k}$, the polyhedron bounded by hyperplanes supporting the G-facets is a full-dimensional simplex. We call a combinatorial hypersimplex **G-generic** if the hyperplanes supporting the G-facets are not projectively concurrent, that is, if the hyperplanes supporting combinatorial $(n-1,k-1)$-hypersimplices do not meet in a point and are not parallel to a common line. We define the notion of **F-generic** hypersimplices likewise and we simply write **FG-generic** if a hypersimplex is F- and G-generic.

Now, if a combinatorial hypersimplex P is G-generic, then there is an admissible projective transformation that makes the polyhedron induced by the G-facets bounded. To find such a transformation, one can proceed as follows: translate P so that it contains 0 in the interior, then take the polar P° and translate it so that the origin belongs to the interior of the convex hull of the G-vertices. This is possible because G-genericity implies that these vertices span a full-dimensional simplex. Taking the polar again yields a polytope P' that is projectively equivalent to P. Since projective transformations leave the extension complexity invariant, the proof of Proposition 12, almost verbatim, carries over to FG-generic hypersimplices.

Indeed, with the upcoming Lemma 17, it is straightforward to verify that F-facets of an FG-generic (n,k)-hypersimplex with $2k \geq n$ are again FG-generic; and the same works with G-facets when $2k \leq n$. Hence, one can apply the inductive reasoning of the $k = 2$ case of Proposition 12; which, together with Proposition 15, proves the following theorem.

Theorem 16. *If P is an FG-generic combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex with $n \geq 6$ and $2 \leq k \leq n-2$, then $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) = 2n$.*

The following lemma states that *every* combinatorial hypersimplex is either F-generic or G-generic.

Lemma 17. *Every combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex is*

(i) *F-generic if $2k < n+2$, and*
(ii) *G-generic if $2k > n-2$.*

In particular, every combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex is FG-generic for $n-2 < 2k < n+2$.

Proof. The two statements are dual under the affine equivalence $\Delta_{n,k} \cong \Delta_{n,n-k}$. Hence, we only prove the second statement. For this, let P° be polar to a combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex with $2k > n-2$. Thus, P° is a polytope of dimension $n-1$ with $2n$ vertices $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ and $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ corresponding to the F- and G-facets. In this setting, G-genericity means that the polytope $Q = \mathrm{conv}(g_1, \ldots, g_n)$ is of full dimension $n-1$. From the combinatorics of (n,k)-hypersimplices, we infer that for every $I \subseteq [n]$ with $|I| = k$, the set

$$\mathrm{conv}\left(\{g_i : i \in I\} \cup \{f_i : i \notin I\}\right)$$

is a face of P° and hence $\mathrm{conv}(g_i : i \in I)$ is a face of Q. Thus Q is a *k-neighborly* polytope with $2k \geq n-1 \geq \dim Q$. It follows from [Grü03, Thm. 7.1.4] that Q is a simplex and thus of dimension $n-1$. □

Although we will later see that not every combinatorial hypersimplex is FG-generic (cf. Proposition 21), this has some immediate consequences for the extension complexity of combinatorial hypersimplices. The following corollary can be deduced from Figure 3, using Corollary 8 to navigate along the arrows to the (thick) diagonal.

Corollary 6. If P is a combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex with $n \geq 6$, then

$$\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \;\geq\; \begin{cases} n+2k+1, & \text{if } \; 2 \leq k < \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor, \\ 2n, & \text{if } \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \leq k \leq \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil, \text{ and} \\ n+2(n-k)+1, & \text{if } \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil < k \leq n-2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For $\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \leq k \leq \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil$, we get the result as a combination of Theorem 16 with Lemma 17. If P is combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex with $k < \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor$, then P has a $2k$-dimensional face Q isomorphic to $\Delta_{2k+1,k}$ (by successively taking F-facets). By the previous case, $\mathrm{rk}_+(Q) = 2(2k+1)$. By Corollary 8, $\mathrm{rk}_+(P) \geq n+2k+1$. The case $k > \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil$ follows symmetrically. □

4.1. **Realization spaces of hypersimplices.** A combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex is a polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ given by $2n$ linear inequalities $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = f_{i0} + \sum_j f_{ij}x_j \geq 0$ and $g_i(\mathbf{x}) = g_{i0} + \sum_j g_{ij}x_j \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ such that P is combinatorially isomorphic to $\Delta_{n,k}$ under the correspondence

$$\begin{aligned} F_i = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{n,k} : x_i = 0\} \quad &\longrightarrow \quad \{\mathbf{x} \in P : f_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}, \text{ and} \\ G_i = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{n,k} : x_i = 1\} \quad &\longrightarrow \quad \{\mathbf{x} \in P : g_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Of course, the inequalities are only unique up to a positive scalar and hence the group $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}_{>0}, \cdot)$ acts on ordered collections of linear inequalities furnished by all combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplices in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. We only want to consider realizations that are genuinely distinct and it is customary to identify two realizations of $\Delta_{n,k}$ that differ by an affine transformation or an (admissible) projective transformation; see, for example, [RG96, Sect. 2.1] or [BLS+99,



FIGURE 3. The smaller hypersimplices. Arrows represent the structure of the F- and G-facets. Those in the upper half are F-generic, those in the lower half are G-generic and those in the middle are FG-generic.

Sect. 8.1]. We do the latter. However, care has to be taken as the projective linear group does not act on the realization space. To that end, we identify P with its **homogenization**

$$\hom(P) \;:=\; \operatorname{cone}(\{1\}\times P) \;=\; \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{array}{l} g_{0i}x_0 + \cdots + g_{ni}x_n \geq 0 \\ f_{0i}x_0 + \cdots + f_{ni}x_n \geq 0 \end{array} \text{ for } i = 1,\dots,n \right\}.$$

Under this identification one verifies that two (n,k)-hypersimplices P and P' are projectively equivalent if and only if $\hom(P)$ and $\hom(P')$ are linearly isomorphic. The **projective realization space** $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$ of combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplices is the set of matrices $(g_1,\dots,g_n,f_1,\dots,f_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times 2n}$ that yield cones isomorphic to the homogenization of the (n,k)-hypersimplex modulo the action of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}_{>0}$. We write $g_i^\perp$ and $f_i^\perp$ for the facet defining hyperplanes of $\hom(P)$ corresponding to g_i and f_i, respectively.

Let us fix $1 < k \leq \frac{n}{2}$ and let P be a combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex. By Lemma 17, the F-facets are generic and hence bound a simplex Q up to projective transformation. That is,

$$\hom(Q) \;=\; \{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n : f_{0i}x_0 + \cdots + f_{ni}x_n \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1,\dots,n\} \;\cong\; \mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$$

by a linear transformation. Hence, we can choose a matrix representing $\hom(P)$ of the form

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccccc|ccc} | & | & & | & & 1 & & \\ g_1 & g_2 & \cdots & g_n & & & \ddots & \\ | & | & & | & & & & 1 \end{array}\right). \tag{4}$$

Modulo positive column and row scaling, the matrix $(g_1,\dots,g_n)$ uniquely determines P up to projective transformations. Indeed, by using suitable positive column scaling on the f_i's, the effect of positively scaling rows of (4) leaves the identity matrix of (4) invariant.

For example, a representative of the standard realization of $\Delta_{n,k}$ is given by the G-matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -k+1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & -k+1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & -k+1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

The G-matrix also gives us a condition for G-genericity. The hyperplanes to G-facets are projectively concurrent if there is a nonzero element in the kernel of the G-matrix. This proves the following useful criterion.

Lemma 18. *Let P be a combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex with $k \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Then P is G-generic if and only if* $\det(g_1, \ldots, g_n) \neq 0$.

Notice that the principal k-minors of (5) vanish. This is common to all combinatorial hypersimplices. Indeed, the combinatorics of hypersimplices dictates that for any $I \subseteq [n]$ with $|I| = k$, the intersection of the hyperplanes $\{g_i^\perp : i \in I\}$ and $\{f_i^\perp : i \notin I\}$ with $\hom(P)$ is a face of dimension 1. By our choice of $f_1, \ldots, f_n$, this is equivalent to

$$\operatorname{rk}(G_{II}) \;=\; k-1 \text{ for all } I \subseteq [n] \text{ with } |I| = k. \tag{6}$$

Notice that these are the only equality constrains for $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$. The remaining conditions are only strict inequalities coming vertex-facet-nonincidences.

The *complex* variety of n-by-n matrices with vanishing principal k-minors was studied by Wheeler in [Whe], which turns out to be a rather complicated object. For example, it is not known if the variety is irreducible and even the dimension is only known in certain cases. The following result yields an upper bound on the dimension of $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$.

Proposition 19. *For $2 < k < n-2$, every $P \in \mathcal{R}_{n,k}$ is completely identified by a realization of $\Delta_{n-1,k-1}$ unique up to affine transformation. In particular, for $2 \leq k \leq n-2$, the dimension of $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$ is at most $\binom{n-1}{2}$.*

Proof. Let P be a combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex. By a suitable projective transformation, we can assume that the facet-defining hyperplanes of F_1 and G_1 are parallel. This assumption fixes the intersection of $\operatorname{aff}(G_1)$ with the hyperplane at infinity and hence fixes G_1 up to an affine transformation.

Since F_1 and G_1 lie in parallel hyperplanes, the corresponding facets of F_1 and G_1 are parallel. A result of Shephard (see [Grü03, Thm. 15.1.3, p.321]) states that if all the 2-faces of a d-polytope Q are triangles, then for any representation $Q = Q_1 + Q_2$ there are $t_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\lambda_i \geq 0$ such that $Q_i = t_i + \lambda_i Q$ for $i = 1, 2$. It follows from this result that any polytope Q' normally equivalent to Q (i.e. combinatorially isomorphic with corresponding facets parallel) is positively homothetic to Q. Since every face of a hypersimplex is a hypersimplex and 2-dimensional hypersimplices are triangles, this shows that F_1 determined up to a positive homothety which shows that given G_1, P is unique up to projective transformations.

The bound on the dimension follows by induction on k. We will see in Theorem 4 that $\dim \mathcal{R}_{n,2} = \binom{n-1}{2}$, settling the base case. The affine group of $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a codimension d subgroup of the projective group. Hence, by induction,

$$\dim \mathcal{R}_{n,k} \;\leq\; \dim \mathcal{R}_{n-1,k-1} + (n-2) \;\leq\; \binom{n-2}{2} + (n-2) \;=\; \binom{n-1}{2}. \qquad \square$$

5. The $(n,2)$-hypersimplices

Although realization spaces are notoriously difficult objects and it is generally difficult to access different realizations of a given polytope, in the case of $(n,2)$-hypersimplices we have a simple construction and a nice geometrical interpretation. Let us denote by $\Delta_{n-1} = \operatorname{conv}(e_1, \ldots, e_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ the **standard simplex** of dimension $n-1$.

Theorem 20. *For $n \geq 4$, let p_{ij} be a point in the relative interior of the edge $[e_i, e_j] \subset \Delta_{n-1}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. Then*

$$P \;:=\; \operatorname{conv}\{p_{ij} : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$$

is a combinatorial $(n,2)$-hypersimplex. Up to projective transformation, every combinatorial $(n,2)$-hypersimplex arises this way.

Proof. Since Δ_{n-1} is a simple polytope, the polytope P is the result of truncating every vertex e_i of Δ_{n-1} by the unique hyperplane spanned by $\{p_{ij} : j \neq i\}$. Hence, P has $\binom{n}{2}$ vertices and every p_{ij} is incident to exactly two facets isomorphic to $\Delta_{n-1,1} \cong \Delta_{n-2}$. If $n = 4$, then it is easily seen that P is an octahedron. For $n > 4$, we get by induction on n that the remaining facets $P \cap \{x : x_i = 0\}$ are isomorphic to $\Delta_{n-1,2}$, which implies the first claim.

For the second statement, let P be a combinatorial $(n, 2)$-hypersimplex. We know from Lemma 17, that the F-facets bound a projective simplex. By a suitable projective transformation, we may assume that this is exactly Δ_{n-1}. Each vertex of P lies in all the F-facets except for two. So every vertex of P lies in the relative interior of a unique edge of Δ_{n-1}. □

Note that the representation given in Theorem 20 is not unique up to projective transformation. The simplest way to factor out the projective transformations is to perform a first truncation at the vertex e_1 of Δ_{n-1}. Then $\operatorname{conv}\{p_{12}, \dots, p_{1n}, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$ is a prism over a simplex, which is projectively unique (cf. [Grü03, Ex. 4.8.30]). It then only remains to choose $\binom{n-1}{2}$ points in the interior of every edge of the base of the prism. Each choice produces a projectively distinct $(n, 2)$-hypersimplex, and every $(n, 2)$-hypersimplex arises this way, up to projective transformation. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.

Theorem 4. For $n \geq 4$, $\mathcal{R}_{n,2}$ is homeomorphic to the interior of a $\binom{n-1}{2}$-dimensional cube. In particular, $\mathcal{R}_{n,2}$ is an open ball and hence contractible.

To recover the description as an $n \times n$ matrix, we can proceed as follows. Set the (projective) simplex Δ_F bounded by the F-facets to be the standard simplex. Now, for every (oriented) edge $[e_i, e_j]$ of Δ_F, consider the ratio $\rho_{ij} = \frac{\|e_i - p_{ij}\|}{\|e_j - p_{ij}\|}$ for $i \neq j$. It is not hard to see that the diagonal entries of the G-matrix are negative and that, if we scale its columns so that they are -1, then we are left with the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & \rho_{12} & \cdots & \rho_{1n} \\ \rho_{21} & -1 & \cdots & \rho_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho_{n1} & \rho_{n2} & \cdots & -1 \end{pmatrix}; \tag{7}$$

containing -1 in the diagonal and the ratios ρ_{ij} in the remaining entries. Notice how the condition on the vanishing 2×2 principal minors coincides with the relation $\rho_{ij} = \rho_{ji}^{-1}$. By Theorem 20, any choice of positive ratios fulfilling this relation gives rise to a realization of an $(n, 2)$-hypersimplex.

All non-diagonal entries are positive by construction. Multiplying the ith column by ρ_{i1} and the ith column by ρ_{1i} for $2 \leq i \leq n$, which corresponds to a projective transformation, we are left with an equivalent realization. Relabelling the ratios, it is of the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & \cdots & \rho_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \rho_{n2} & \cdots & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{8}$$

Choosing a realization of $\Delta_{n,2}$ up to projective transformation amounts to choosing $\binom{n-1}{2}$ positive ratios and we recover the description of Theorem 4. Actually, this is the transformation that we also used before, which transforms the truncated simplex into a prism over a simplex. The $\binom{n-1}{2}$ remaining ratios correspond to the edges of the basis of the prism.

Notice that, although a similar argumentation provides the realization space up to affine transformation, that setup is slightly more delicate. While a choice of a point on each of the $\binom{n}{2}$ edges of a standard simplex gives a unique affine realization of $\Delta_{n,2}$, not every affine realization can be obtained this way: The F-simplex might be unbounded for some realizations of $\Delta_{n,2}$. Hence, there are several "patches" in the affine realization space, each one corresponding to

a different relative position of the F-simplex with respect to the hyperplane at infinity. For every patch, realizations are parametrized by the position of the points in the edges of Δ_F.

Example 3. To show an example, we will work with $\Delta_{3,2}$, which we look at as two nested projective simplices, the second being the convex hull of a point in each edge of the first. Even though this is not strictly a hypersimplex, it provides simpler figures than $\Delta_{4,2}$. Figure 4 depicts four such realizations.



FIGURE 4. Four (projectively equivalent) realizations of $\Delta_{3,2}$ as two nested (projective) simplices.

In the first three, the outer simplex is a standard simplex. Computing the ratios of (7) we recover the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 3 & 1 \\ \frac{1}{3} & -1 & 3 \\ 1 & \frac{1}{3} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 3 & \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{1}{3} & -1 & 1 \\ 3 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 3 & 3 \\ \frac{1}{3} & -1 & 9 \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{9} & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can transform the first into the second (resp. third) by multiplying the third row by 3 (resp. $\frac{1}{3}$) and the third column by $\frac{1}{3}$ (resp. 3), which means that they represent projectively equivalent realizations. To fix a unique projective representative, we send e_1 to infinity, and impose that p_{12}, p_{13}, e_2, e_3 form a prism over a standard simplex (in this case a square), as in the fourth figure. The ratios that we get on the base of the prism give the entries of the matrix corresponding to (8):

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 9 \\ 1 & \frac{1}{9} & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this example, this projective transformation corresponds to multiplying the second row and the third column of the first matrix by 3, and its third row and second column by $\frac{1}{3}$.

With the aid of this description, we can produce our first example of a non FG-generic hypersimplex. The following is due to Francisco Santos (personal communication), who found nicer coordinates than our original example.

Proposition 21. *There are $(6,2)$-hypersimplices that are not G-generic.*

Proof. The following matrix corresponds to a non-G-generic realization of $\Delta_{6,2}$

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2\sqrt{6}+5 & -2\sqrt{6}+5 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -2\sqrt{6}+5 & -1 & 2\sqrt{6}+5 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2\sqrt{6}+5 & -2\sqrt{6}+5 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It can be checked that the determinant is zero and Lemma 18 finishes the proof. □

Corollary 22. *Not every combinatorial (n,k)-hypersimplex is a facet of a combinatorial $(n+1,k+1)$-hypersimplex.*

Proof. Every combinatorial $(7,3)$-hypersimplex is FG-generic by Lemma 17, a property that is inherited by its G-facets. Hence, the combinatorial $(6,2)$-hypersimplex of Proposition 21 is not a facet of any combinatorial $(7,3)$-hypersimplex. □

5.1. **The $(5,2)$-hypersimplex.** The $(5,2)$-hypersimplex is special. As we argued in the proof of Proposition 15, the nonnegative rank of the hypersimplex $\Delta_{5,2}$ in its defining realization (1) is equal to 9. In light of Theorem 1, this deviates from the 'expected' nonnegative rank. The goal of this section is to show that *generic* realizations of $\Delta_{5,2}$ have nonnegative rank 10.

We just described the (projective) realization space of $\Delta_{5,2}$ obtained by choosing an interior point in every edge of the base of $\Delta_3 \times \Delta_1$. That means that $\dim \mathcal{R}_{5,2} = 6$.

We now claim that the realization P of $\Delta_{5,2}$ given as the convex hull of the columns

$$\begin{pmatrix} 35 & 35 & 35 & 35 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 35 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 50 & 42 & 20 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 35 & 0 & 0 & 20 & 0 & 0 & 56 & 60 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 35 & 0 & 0 & 28 & 0 & 14 & 0 & 42 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 35 & 0 & 0 & 50 & 0 & 10 & 28 \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$

has nonnegative rank 10. To prove this, we again use a computer to compute the refined rectangle covering number from [OVW]. Like the ordinary rectangle covering number, the refined rectangle covering number yields lower bounds on the nonnegative rank of a polytope P but instead of only the support pattern of the slack matrix S_P, it takes into account simple relations between the actual values. A covering of $S = S_P$ by rectangles $R_1, \dots, R_s$ is **refined** if for any pair of indices $(i,k),(j,l)$ such that

$$S_{ik}S_{jl} \;>\; S_{il}S_{jk} \tag{10}$$

there have to be at least two rectangles covering S_{ik}, S_{jl}. Of course, if S_{il} or S_{jk} are zero, then this reduces to the condition for ordinary rectangles. The **refined rectangle covering number** $\operatorname{rrc}(S_P)$ is the least size of a refined covering. It is shown in [OVW, Theorem 3.4] that $\operatorname{rrc}(S_P)$ lies between $\operatorname{rc}(S_P)$ and $\operatorname{rk}_+(P)$ and thus yields a possibly better lower bound on the nonnegative rank. We will work with the following relaxation that we call the **generic** refined rectangle covering number. We consider coverings by ordinary rectangles with the additional condition that for any pair of indices $(i,k),(j,l)$ such that

$$S_{ik}, S_{jl}, S_{il}, S_{jk} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad S_{ik}S_{jl} \;\neq\; S_{il}S_{jk}, \tag{11}$$

the four entries $S_{ik}, S_{jl}, S_{il}, S_{jk}$ are covered by at least two rectangles. The denomination 'generic' is explained in the proof of Theorem 23 below.

As for the rectangle covering number, to determine if there is a generic refined covering of a given size can be phrased as a Boolean formula. For the example given above and the number of rectangles set to 9, a `python` script in the appendix produces such a formula with 450 Boolean variables and 16796 clauses. Any suitable SAT solver verifies that this formula is unsatisfiable which proves that the $(5,2)$-hypersimplex given in (9) has nonnegative rank 10.

Theorem 23. *The set of $(5,2)$-hypersimplices with nonnegative rank 10 form a dense open subset of $\mathcal{R}_{5,2}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the collection of all pairs of indices $(i,k;j,l)$ satisfying (11) in the realization of $\Delta_{5,2}$ given in (9). The set of realizations $X \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{5,2}$ for which (11) is not satisfied for some $(i,k;j,l) \in \mathcal{I}$ form an algebraic subset of $\mathcal{R}_{5,2}$. Since the realization (9) is not in X, this shows that X is a proper subset and hence of measure zero in the open set $\mathcal{R}_{5,2}$. □

The same result extends easily to the remaining $(n,2)$-hypersimplices.

Corollary 5. For $n \geq 5$, the combinatorial $(n, 2)$-hypersimplices with extension complexity $2n$ are dense in $\mathcal{R}_{n,2}$.

Proof. For $n = 5$, this is the previous result. For $n \geq 6$, this follows from Theorem 16 with the fact that FG-generic hypersimplices form a dense open subset of $\mathcal{R}_{n,2}$, because G-genericity is equivalent to the determinant of (8) being non-zero (Lemma 18). □

Our lack of control over the realization spaces of other hypersimplex does not allow us to extend this result to higher values of k. Nevertheless, we conjecture that except for a subset of zero measure, all (n, k)-hypersimplices have nonnegative rank $2n$ (for $n \geq 5$). (Notice that the existence of particular instances already ensures the existence of open neighborhoods of hypersimplices of nonnegative rank $2n$.)

Conjecture 2. For $n \geq 5$ and $2 \leq k \leq n-2$, the combinatorial hypersimplices of nonnegative rank $2n$ form a dense open subset of $\mathcal{R}_{n,k}$.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Stefan Weltge, for help with the computation of rectangle covering numbers and Günter Ziegler for insightful discussions regarding realizations of hypersimplices. We are indebted to Francisco Santos for extensive discussions regarding realization spaces of hypersimplices. The coordinates for the example in Proposition 21 are due to him.

References

[BHJ14] Anton Belov, Marijn J. H. Heule, and Matti Järvisalo (eds.), *Proceedings of SAT competition 2014*, Department of Computer Science Series of Publications B, vol. B-2014-2, University of Helsinki, 2014, Solver available at http://fmv.jku.at/lingeling.

[BLS+99] Anders Björner, Michel Las Vergnas, Bernd Sturmfels, Neil White, and Günter M. Ziegler, *Oriented matroids*, second ed., Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 46, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[FKPT13] Samuel Fiorini, Volker Kaibel, Kanstantsin Pashkovich, and Dirk Oliver Theis, *Combinatorial bounds on nonnegative rank and extended formulations*, Discrete Math. **313** (2013), no. 1, 67–83.

[FMP+15] Samuel Fiorini, Serge Massar, Sebastian Pokutta, Hans Raj Tiwary, and Ronald de Wolf, *Exponential lower bounds for polytopes in combinatorial optimization*, J. ACM **62** (2015), no. 2, Art. 17, 23.

[FRT12] Samuel Fiorini, Thomas Rothvoß, and Hans Raj Tiwary, *Extended formulations for polygons*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **48** (2012), no. 3, 658–668.

[GGMS87] I. M. Gel′fand, R. M. Goresky, R. D. MacPherson, and V. V. Serganova, *Combinatorial geometries, convex polyhedra, and Schubert cells*, Adv. in Math. **63** (1987), no. 3, 301–316.

[GJ00] Ewgenij Gawrilow and Michael Joswig, *polymake: a framework for analyzing convex polytopes*, Polytopes — Combinatorics and Computation (Gil Kalai and Günter M. Ziegler, eds.), Birkhäuser, 2000, pp. 43–74.

[GRT13] João Gouveia, Richard Z. Robinson, and Rekha R. Thomas, *Polytopes of minimum positive semidefinite rank*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **50** (2013), no. 3, 679–699.

[Grü03] Branko Grünbaum, *Convex polytopes*, second ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 221, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.

[GS] Francesco Grande and Raman Sanyal, *Theta rank, levelness, and matroid minors*, Preprint, August 2014, 21 pages, arXiv:1408.1262.

[KLTT15] Hartmut Klauck, Troy Lee, Dirk Oliver Theis, and Rekha R. Thomas, *Limitations of convex programming: lower bounds on extended formulations and factorization ranks (Dagstuhl Seminar 15082)*, Dagstuhl Reports **5** (2015), no. 2, 109–127.

[KW15] Volker Kaibel and Stefan Weltge, *A short proof that the extension complexity of the correlation polytope grows exponentially*, Discrete & Computational Geometry **53** (2015), no. 2, 396–401.

[Mnë88] Nikolai E. Mnëv, *The universality theorems on the classification problem of configuration varieties and convex polytopes varieties*, Topology and Geometry—Rohlin Seminar, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1346, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1988, pp. 527–544.

[OVW] Michael Oelze, Arnaud Vandaele, and Stefan Weltge, *Computing the extension complexities of all 4-dimensional 0/1-polytopes*, Preprint, June 2014, 21 pages, arXiv:1406.4895.

[PP15] Arnau Padrol and Julian Pfeifle, *Polygons as sections of higher-dimensional polytopes*, Electron. J. Combin. **22** (2015), no. 1, Paper 1.24, 16.

[RG96] Jürgen Richter-Gebert, *Realization spaces of polytopes*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1643, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.

[Rot13] Thomas Rothvoß, *Some 0/1 polytopes need exponential size extended formulations*, Math. Program. **142** (2013), no. 1-2, Ser. A, 255–268.

[Rot14] ———, *The matching polytope has exponential extension complexity*, Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (New York, NY, USA), STOC '14, ACM, 2014, pp. 263–272.

[Shi] Yaroslav Shitov, *Sublinear extensions of polygons*, Preprint, December 2014, 10 pages, arXiv:1412.0728.

[Shi14] ———, *An upper bound for nonnegative rank*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **122** (2014), 126–132.

[Whe] Ashley K. Wheeler, *Ideals generated by principal minors*, Preprint, August 2015, 15 pages, arXiv:1410.1910.

Fachbereich Mathematik und Informatik, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

E-mail address: fgrande@math.fu-berlin.de

Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu - Paris Rive Gauche (UMR 7586), Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris 6), Paris, France

E-mail address: arnau.padrol@imj-prg.fr

Fachbereich Mathematik und Informatik, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

E-mail address: sanyal@math.fu-berlin.de